



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,866	06/02/2004	Otis L. Nelson JR.	200404PM	3865
23688	7590	03/28/2007		
Bruce E. Harang PO BOX 872735 VANCOUVER, WA 98687-2735			EXAMINER KRISHNAN, MALINI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1714	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/28/2007	PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

5

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/709,866	<b>Applicant(s)</b> NELSON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Malini Krishnan	<b>Art Unit</b> 1714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/02/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 4-7 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims all recite the limitation "the base fuel". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claim 1, 4-8, 10-12, 14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson ('723) in view of Lyben ('304).

Nelson discloses a motor fuel additive composition comprising (a) a fuel conditioner component and (b) a detergent component. The fuel conditioner (a) comprises (i) from 2 to 50 percent by weight of a polar oxygenated hydrocarbon compound and (ii) from about 2 to about 50 percent by weight of an oxygenated compatibilizing agent. The detergent component (b) is selected from the group consisting of (i) a reaction product of a substituted hydrocarbon (A) and an amino compound (B), and (ii) a polybutylamine or polyisobutylamine (see abstract). The polar oxygenated hydrocarbon has an average molecular weight of from about 200 to about 500, and acid number of about 25 to 175, and a saponification number of about 75 to about 200 (col. 7, lines 11-33). The oxygenated compatibilizing agent has a solubility parameter of from about 7.0 to about 14.0 and moderate to strong hydrogen-bonding capacity (col. 7, lines 53-62). The hydrocarbon compound (A) of the detergent component is a substituted hydrocarbon of the formula  $R_1-X$  wherein  $R_1$  is a hydrocarbyl radical having a molecular weight in the range of about 150 to 10,000 and X is selected from the group consisting of halogens, succinic anhydride and succinic dibasic acid (col. 4, lines 52-65). The amino compound (B) is of the formula  $H-(NH-(A)_m)_n-Y-R_2$  wherein Y, A, m, n, and  $R_2$  are identical to those in the instant claim 8 (col. 5, lines 1-21). The polybutylamine or polyisobutylamine is identical to that in instant claim 8 (col. 6, lines 30-46). Further, the composition includes other additives such as methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE) and ethyl tertiary butyl ether (ETBE), alcohols such as methanol or ethanol, and additives that are "typically employed in motor fuels" such as a common anti-knock additive, tetraethyl lead (col. 9, lines 56-60). Nelson also discloses

Art Unit: 1714

examples wherein the additive composition was added to a base fuel in amounts between 40 ppm and 1000 ppm (col. 10, lines 44-50; col. 11, lines 14-20).

Nelson is silent with respect to the composition comprising a lead scavenger compound.

Lyben discloses leaded motor fuels containing anti-knock agents such as tetraethyl lead, wherein a means for removing the lead-containing products of combustion known in the art includes providing an alkyl halide lead scavenger such as ethylene dibromide and ethylene dichloride. Further, the process known as scavenging proves to be beneficial in that the lead scavengers, when co-present with the anti-knock agents reacted in a combustion chamber of an engine with the combustion products of the antiknock agents to form volatile lead halides, which in turn are efficiently removed from the combustion chamber during the exhaust cycle (col. 1, lines 20-40).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Nelson and Lyben, and include ethylene dibromide or dichloride as a lead scavenger in the additive composition of Nelson, which contains tetraethyl lead, an anti-knock agent. The scavenger would be beneficial to the composition in aiding removal of lead-containing products of combustion.

Regarding claims 6 and 7, although Nelson and Lyben do not disclose the addition of the additive composition to the base fuel simultaneously or after other additives, it is noted that "[E]ven though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in

Art Unit: 1714

the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process", *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Further, "although produced by a different process, the burden shifts to applicant to come forward with evidence establishing an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product", *In re Marosi*, 710 F.2d 798, 802, 218 USPQ 289, 292 (Fed. Cir. 1983). See MPEP 2113.

Therefore, absent evidence of criticality regarding the presently claimed addition of the additive composition to the base fuel simultaneously or after other additives and given that Nelson and Lyben meet the requirements of the claimed composition, Nelson and Lyben clearly meet the requirements of present claims 6 and 7.

6. Claims 2-3, 9, 13, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson in view of Lyben, and further in view of Carlson ('088).

The disclosure of Nelson and Lyben in paragraph 5 above is herein incorporated by reference.

Both Nelson and Lyben are silent with respect to the amount of alkyl lead compound included in the composition.

Carlson discloses a motor fuel composition including alkyl lead anti-knock agents such as tetraethyl lead, included in low amounts within the range of about 0.5 to about 3.0 grams per gallon. The effectiveness of tetraethyl lead to raise the octane number and suppress knocking decreases with increasing quantities. Therefore, a small

Art Unit: 1714

amount in the range disclosed proves to be beneficial to the composition (col. 1, lines 10-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to combine the teachings of Nelson, Lyben, and Carlson in order to utilize the benefits of tetraethyl lead at low amounts.

7. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson in view of Carlson ('088).

The disclosure of Nelson in paragraph 5 above is herein incorporated by reference.

Nelson is silent with respect to the composition comprising a lead scavenger compound, and the amount of anti-knock additive, tetraethyl lead, included in the composition.

Carlson discloses a motor fuel composition including alkyl lead anti-knock agents such as tetraethyl lead, and alkyl halide lead scavengers such as ethylene dibromide and dichloride. Tetraethyl lead is included in low amounts within the range of about 0.5 to 3.0 grams per gallon. The effectiveness of tetraethyl lead to raise the octane number and suppress knocking decreases with increasing quantities. Therefore, a small amount in the range disclosed proves to be beneficial (col. 1, lines 10-35). The lead scavengers, such as ethylene dibromide and ethylene dichloride, impart useful properties to the fuel in its use in internal combustion engines (col. 3, lines 56-71).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to combine the teachings of Nelson and Carlson in order to utilize the benefits of alkyl lead anti-knock agents and alkyl halide lead scavengers as disclosed in Carlson.

Regarding claims 6 and 7, although Nelson and Carlson do not disclose the addition of the additive composition to the base fuel simultaneously or after other additives, it is noted that "[E]ven though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process", *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Further, "although produced by a different process, the burden shifts to applicant to come forward with evidence establishing an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product", *In re Marosi*, 710 F.2d 798, 802, 218 USPQ 289, 292 (Fed. Cir. 1983). See MPEP 2113.

Therefore, absent evidence of criticality regarding the presently claimed addition of the additive composition to the base fuel simultaneously or after other additives and given that Nelson and Carlson meet the requirements of the claimed composition, Nelson and Carlson clearly meet the requirements of present claims 6 and 7.



Art Unit: 1714

**Conclusion**

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. 5516343.
9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Malini Krishnan whose telephone number is 571-272-6519. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 am - 5:00 pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on 571-272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Malini Krishnan

*UK*

*Vasu Jagannathan*  
VASU JAGANNATHAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700